

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/824,449 First Named Applicant: Kendall G. Young
Examiner: Robert M. Timblin Art Unit: 2167 Status of Application: Final

Tentative Participants:

(1) Denver S. Bisignano (2) _____
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: August 5, 2009 Proposed Time: 3:00 PM EST AM/PM ☒

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-5, 8, 10-13,</u>	<u>Schmugar 6,654,751</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>15-23, 25-27,</u>	<u>Goodwin 7,200,592</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>29-34, 36-43</u>	<u>Anwar 2001/0047355</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	<u>Dworski 7,076,484</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<u>Aaron 20050015382</u>			

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

See Attachment 1

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

[Signature]
Applicant's Representative Signature
Denver S. Bisignano
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
60,693
Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Attachment 1

Brief Description of Arguments

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited patent documents, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest all featured method steps/operations or the featured processing module to perform the featured steps/operations as previously presented. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants respectfully plan to submit some proposed claim amendments for review prior to the requested interview date, and request discussing the claims with respect to the cited patent documents.

For example, Applicants note that Schmugar, the primary reference, describes a virus information data collector or a virus information patrol (VIP) system (100) (premised in the Office Action as being an automated software agent) that monitors virus information repositories (typically in the form of web pages), which provides system administrators detailed description information alerts or news information about viruses. Schmugar further describes accessing virus description data (premised in the Office Action to being pertinent inputs) and assigning a type-category to new virus description data (premised in the Office Action as teaching contextually mapping pertinent inputs (the virus description data) to a dynamic reference repository, to a specified capability). Applicants respectfully submit that Schmugar, however, does not disclose, teach, or suggest various claimed, or to be more positively claimed, features including:

(1) contextually mapping a same term found within pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (having unrelated meanings therebetween): to differentiate the same term between the at least two different information resources, to facilitate proper use the same term by a user of the dynamic reference repository, and to maintain integrity of each separate assigned meaning to the same term;

(2) mapping an enterprise technical requirement received from a procuring entity and a plurality of pertinent technologies providing different technical solutions to a desired capability;

(3) dynamically updating a knowledge map between enterprise requirements, enterprise technology, subject matter expert expertise, and enterprise capabilities responsive to updated identified enterprise requirements, updated identified enterprise technologies, and updated identified enterprise subject matter expert expertise (even if Schmugar Fig. 10 is considered a knowledge map, the figure does not show each of such items);

(4) analyzing and drawing logical linkages between stored repository documents, capability assessments directed to the enterprise, and enterprise subject matter expert inputs;

(5) initiating contact with a [human] subject matter expert (SME) with an online [two-way] communication and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability--the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME review or assessment (the Web sites listed in Fig. 10, item 1006, are antivirus company Web sites, and not an interactive enterprise website);

(6) running periodic prioritized customizable agent searches prioritized to specific reference materials [among multiple reference materials] (patrolling of antivirus Web sites would

not suggest prioritized patrolling as it is only directed to virus descriptors presented in web pages--a single type of reference/material);

(7) contextually relating use of a same term (e.g., an acronym) within each associated different information resource separately for each associated different information resource;

(8) interpreting the meaning of a same term differently for at least two different information resources to differentiate each meaning of the term relative to the respective information resource to thereby prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term (obtaining different virus descriptors for different companies would not be the equivalent of interpreting the meaning of a same term differently across multiple information resources--there would be no same term having different meanings at the different antivirus Web sites);

(9) differentiate a first meaning behind a term with respect to a first associated information resource and a second meaning behind the term with respect to a second information resource to thereby prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term;

(10) providing tailored notice individually tailored for each separate one of a plurality of users responsive to a list of keywords provided by the respective user and different from that of each other of the plurality of users (providing a search engine that is described as having a use unrelated to an automated notification process would not be considered a teaching thereof);

(11) redefining contextually a definition of a term underlying at least one database responsive to one or more identified pertinent inputs identifying a change in a usage of the term therein (having differently worded virus descriptors among different companies would not be recognized as a teaching thereof);

(12) recognizing a global replacement of a name (first name) of a data item in an information resource with a different name (second name) to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item referred to by the different name in the information resource (a description involving use of a variant/alias is a description of use of an alternative name, and not a teaching of a global replacement of a name, and even if it were, it would not be considered a teaching of a software agent recognizing such global replacement);

(13) generating a subject matter expert [input] request for information required to produce the determined pertinent inputs to thereby obtain the required pertinent inputs required to satisfy the desired capability (scanning a website of an antivirus company would not be recognized as a teaching thereof);

(14) providing automated feedback to a customizable agent responsive to a user refusing the undesired information included in the search results returned during a current dynamic agent search to thereby update a next dynamic agent search (providing a relevancy ranking of the displayed search would not be recognized as a teaching of such specific criteria thereof); or

(15) integrating retrieved documents having a plurality of different document formats into a common standard format used within an enterprise architecture system (formatting results of a VIP query for presentation to a VIP subscriber would not be recognized as a teaching thereof).

Applicants further understand that it is premised that Goodwin teaches e-mails containing subject matter expert assessments addressed to a dynamic reference repository. Applicants respectfully submit that Goodwin describes a system and method for synchronizing profile data

based on one or more changes in relationship information (i.e., affinity) between individuals and subject matter/knowledge data typically via use of metadata information associated with stored content. Goodwin further describes that its method and system include provisions for mapping information stored in a data repository to a user having an affinity to such information, for identifying changes in affinities of one or more persons to the information and synchronizing the changes with profile data associated with the one or more persons, and for allowing a user to search knowledge data based on the user affinity to the information. Goodwin describes that its system can include an e-mails spider capable of accessing one or more e-mail databases (electronic mailing groups of an organization) to extract the necessary relationship information between individuals and subject matter. Goodwin does not, however, disclose, teach, or suggest that the e-mails contain a subject matter expert assessment of a desired enterprise capability.

Applicants further understand that it is premised that Aaron teaches extracting "pertinent inputs" from communications addressed to the Aaron system to add to the knowledge of a repository, and that it is further premised that Anwar teaches dynamic updating of a "search" responsive to search habits of the user. Applicants respectfully submit that the e-mails (identified in Aaron as being directed to the Aaron system) are instead understood to be a database query request (in natural language form) including search terms used to query a database to thereby retrieve information from the database/repository, and not "pertinent inputs" that could be used to add to the collective knowledge to the database/repository, itself. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Anwar describes updating how search *results* are displayed, based on search habits, and not the underlying current or next search, itself, and even if considered as such, such updating is at least not responsive to a user specifically refusing undesired information returned as part of the search (which Applicants submit would not be the equivalent of providing a results or relevancy rating for the overall search). Applicants note that any relevancy or ranking is directed to entire search results, and not individual portions (undesired information).

Applicants further understand that it is premised that Dworkis teaches redefining the name of a data item responsive to the [recognition of a] global replacement in the data item in an information resource to retrieve articles, knowledge or pieces of information containing the data item previously referred to by a different name in the respective information resource. Dworkis describes a system and method for searching information within a communications network and presenting the information in the form of an automatically generated or retrieved research model and/or research report, which includes a thesaurus data store containing synonyms for various search terms. Applicants respectfully submit that nothing is disclosed with respect to using the thesaurus data store to automatically recognize a global replacement of one name with that of another, or more specifically, based on contextual usage of the different name in the article or other piece of information.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited patent documents, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the various featured steps/operations or processing module to perform the featured steps/operations as Applicants respectfully request to further discuss during the interview.